

Vision Group B-Governance and Medical Control
Meeting Minutes for January 11, 2000 10-4p
DoubleTree Club Hotel, Ontario

I. Introduction:

- A. Members Present: Chuck Baucom, Chair; Ron Blaul, Co-Chair; Bill Cody; Michael Harris; Virginia Hastings; Ray Johnson, M.D.; Lou Meyer; Gerald Simon
- B. Alternates Present: Sheldon Gilbert; Ron Mayfield; Dave Nevins; Jan Ogar, R.N.; Mike Osur; Kevin White
- C. Audience Members: Mike Frenn; Leonard Inch
- D. Members Absent: Nancy Cassaza, R.N.; Jennifer Hardcastle, R.N.; Kelly Hubbell, R.N.; Dick Mayberry; Bill McCammon
- E. Alternates Absent: None
- F. EMSA Staff Present: Richard Watson; Maureen McNeil; Miranda Swanson; Sheila Keller; Shirley Tsagris

II. Approval of Minutes:

- A. Dave Nevins requested the spelling of his name be corrected. It was also requested that the minutes be done in rich text format.

III. Business Items:

- A. Miranda Swanson, Vision Implementation Project Manager, was introduced to the committee. A master calendar will be placed on the Internet showing scheduled meetings and conference calls.
 - It was suggested that this information should also include deliverables with time frames.
 - Each Vision Committee will be developing an action plan that will have this information.
 - Ron Blaul would like to see the action plans by the end of January.
- B. There was discussion of Vision Group Processes.
 - Ron Blaul explained the Vision Group process that each group would be following.
 - Group felt that they could request various county counsels, organization attorneys, etc., to give a preliminary review.
 - It was also suggested to not use the list server for individual replies.
 - Information on list serves will also be included in the committee handbook.
- C. Discussion on Finance Committee Proposal.

- Identifying relative value to the EMS components of the 911 call. The components that will be looked at are the PSAPs, dispatch, first response and transportation. The focus group needs professional help to formulate statistical data.

Focus Group Reports

1. Focus Group #1 - Ron Blaul

- Objectives 2, 3, & 6.
- Nothing new to report. Group has not met. Ron will send out previous documents.

A. Discussion:

The committee recommended finding out the status of LEMSA medical directors - full time, contract, etc. EMDAC recently did a survey of status.

2. Focus Group #2 - Chuck Baucom

- Objectives 1, 4, 5, & 17.

Objective #1

- Group's recommendation for implementing Objective #1, was distributed. The group recommended that the process be memorialized in the State EMS Plan.

A. Discussion:

- 1) There was discussion about how stakeholders would be notified when a task force is being established.
- 2) EMSA should seek a written response of acceptance or decline.
- 3) There should be a core group of constituents and a list of others depending on the topic.
- 4) A matrix should be on the web site identifying which task forces will be established, which ones have been established, and who the members are.
- 5) Minutes from the task force meetings should also be posted.

B. Summary:

- 1) Chuck will take the input, finalize the objective, and bring the finalized document to the next meeting.
- 2) Objectives will be presented to the Commission during the Vision update.
- 3) Objectives will not be placed on the agenda as action items.
- 4) It was suggested that the Commission should have a say in how the Vision Documents will be handled. This will be added to the Commission Agenda as an action item.
- 5) The committee recommended developing a matrix to send to constituent groups identifying task forces that could be established with proposed time lines.

C. Special Notes:

- 1) The other focus group will be covered later, in order to allow time for Focus Group #3's report.

D. Action Items:

- 1) Person responsible - Chuck Baucom
 - 2) Time line - **Will complete and email to the members by January 21, 2000.**
3. Focus Group #3 - Bill McCammon (report given by Michael Harris)
- Objectives 15 & 16 (shared governance, 201 & 224).
- A. Discussion:
- 1) A written report was distributed.
 - 2) Proposal establishes local commissions that will report to EMSA and have the LEMSA report to the Local Commission. The Local Commission will be made up of the system stakeholders (identified in attachment A).
 - 3) Other provisions include:
 - systems issues decided by a local commission with mandated final authority.
 - system revenues will be balanced to maintain the pre-hospital minimum service level “floor” throughout the entire system.
 - a portion of the revenue from the system will be used to provide and maintain the pre-hospital system infrastructure.
 - pre-hospital resources will be coordinated in order to insure a seamless delivery of service, based on a plan approved by the local commission.
 - dispatch of pre-hospital resources within the system will be coordinated in order to insure seamless delivery of service.
 - all system participants must enter into a standardized agreement with the Local Commission, and agree to follow all policies and procedures approved by the Local Commission.
 - the Local Commission will only enter into agreements with system participants that insure the financial viability of the pre-hospital delivery system.
 - 4) There was significant discussion over the Local Commission makeup, whether a local EMS agency should have a representative, and why the LEMSA was not identified as a major stakeholder.
 - 5) The focus group felt the LEMSA would be staff to the Commission. Adding the LEMSA was not seen as a problem.
 - 6) It was also recommended that law enforcement be represented. Since law enforcement is not actively involved in all counties, a member at large position could be used for law enforcement.
 - 7) There was also concern over having managed care/payor as a member and whether the Fire Chief/private ambulance provider could vote on matters impacting them (conflict of interest).
 - 8) An option might be to have a JPA made up of only elected officials.
 - 9) Commission would be responsible to see that there is a seamless provision of EMS with identified funding.
 - 10) There was also discussion on conceptual approval versus actual process.

The cities may not be seeking final approval, but rather a seat at the table to discuss issues of concern. Counties are concerned about taking the final authority away from the county, but leaving them with the responsibility.

- 11) There should also be an appeal process that could deal with issues without going to court.
- 12) It was suggested that #8 be eliminated. It was also felt that the areas the Commission would have mandated final authority for be clearly defined.

B. Summary:

- 1) The focus group will take the input and revise their recommendations.
Virginia Hastings will distribute the document to EMSAAC for input.

VI. Tentative Agenda for the Next Meeting and Date

A. Next meetings scheduled for February 23 in Oakland and March 16 in Ontario.

- **Gerald Simon will arrange the meeting location for the February 23 meeting and Ron Mayfield will arrange the meeting location for the March 16 meeting.**